

***DETAILED ACTION***

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/07/2008 has been entered.

***Response to Amendment***

This Office action has been issued in response to amendment filed on 07/07/2008. Claims 5-6, 8, 16, 22-23, 33, 36-37, 45 and 49 are cancelled and claims 1-4, 7, 9-15, 17-21, 24-32, 34-35, 38-44 and 46-48 are pending. Applicants' arguments have been carefully and respectfully considered and moot in view of new ground of rejection.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments have been carefully and respectfully considered and moot in view of new ground of rejection.

***Claim Objections***

Claims 35 and 38 are objected to because they are storage claims respectively depending on methods 30 and 33. Examiner is interpreting that claims 35 and 35 are dependent on storage claim 34. Corrections are required

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-4, 7, 9-10, 15, 18-21, 24-27, 34-35, 38-39 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soltis, Steven R (hereinafter Soltis) US Patent No 6697846 in view of Cox, David E. et al (hereinafter Cox) US Patent No 6728766.

As per claim 1, Soltis discloses:

**A method of operating a storage server, the method comprising:**

**receiving at the storage server, from a client, a first request to perform a storage-related operation relating to a set of data;**

(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-26).

**responding to the first request at the storage server by using metadata in the storage server to determine whether the set of data is stored externally to, and remotely from, the storage server;**

(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-26).

**generating a second request in the storage server response to determining that the set of data is stored externally to, and remotely from, the storage server;**

Art Unit: 2165

(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-26, wherein data is storage on shared device separate from the actual server ).

**and sending a second response in accordance with the first response from the storage server to the client.**

(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-26, wherein request/response are exchanged between client and server)

Soltis does not explicitly disclose of policy engine, However Cox in an analogous of client/server data handling, teaches:

**sending the second request and information relating to the set of data from the storage server to a policy engine,**

(Column 5, lines 38-45).

**wherein the policy engine responds to the second request by retrieving the set of data from storage on behalf of the storage server and provides the set of data to the storage server in conjunction with a first response;**

(FIG. 1, and column 4, lines 53-56).

**receiving the first response and the set of data at the storage server, from the policy engine,**

(FIG. 1, and column 4, lines 53-56).

**the first response indicating a result of the policy engine having implemented a policy based on the information relating to the set of data;**

(Column 12, lines 50-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox by incorporating the teaching of Cox into the method of Soltis. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the policy engine of Cox into the system of Soltis for the purpose of adhering user and system activities to a centralized policy management.

As per claim 2, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the policy engine is external to the storage server.**

(FIG. 1)(Cox).

As per claim 3, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the storage server and at least a portion of the policy engine are implemented in a single physical platform.**

(Column 13, lines 4-9)(Cox).

As per claim 4, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the first request is a request for a file managed by the storage server.**

(Column 2, lines 52-56)(Soltis).

As per claim 7, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 4, wherein the file type of the file is indicated in the information relating to the set of data.**

(Column 2, lines 52-56, wherein the file type is incorporated with the requested file)(Soltis).

As per claim 9, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the policy engine determines whether to approve or deny the second request based on an identity of the client.**

(Column 5, lines 38-61)(Cox).

Art Unit: 2165

As per claim 10, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the policy engine determines whether to approve or deny the second request based on an identity of a user of the client.**

(Column 4, lines 62-67)(Cox).

As per claim 15, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the storage server defers sending the client any response to the first request until the storage server receives the first response from the policy engine.**

(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 62-67, illustrate the authentication of the user being done at policy management server wherein intermediary server has to wait for feedback being responding to the client)(Cox).

As per claim 18, Soltis discloses:

**A method of operating a policy engine, the method comprising: from a storage server, a first request and information relating to a set of data,**

(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-26).

**the first request being in response to a storage related client request received by the storage server from a client and relating to the set of data;**

(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-26).

**Soltis the first response to cause the storage server to send a second response to the client in accordance with the first response.**

(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-26, wherein request/response are exchanged between client and server), but does not explicitly disclose of policy engine, However Cox in an analogous of client/server data handling, teaches:

Art Unit: 2165

receiving at the policy engine,

(FIG. 1).

applying a policy in the policy engine using the information relating to a set of data;

(FIG. 1 and Column 5, lines 37-42).

responding to the first request at the policy engine by retrieving the set of data from storage on behalf of the storage server; and

(FIG. 1, and column 4, lines 53-56).

providing the set of data from the policy engine to the storage server in conjunction with a first response, the first response indicating a result of applying the policy,

(FIG. 1, and column 4, lines 53-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox by incorporating the teaching of Cox into the method of Soltis. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the policy engine of Cox into the system of Soltis for the purpose of adhering user and system activities to a centralized policy management.

As per claim 19, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 18, wherein the policy engine is external to the storage server.**

(FIG. 1)(Cox).

As per claim 20, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 18, wherein the storage server and at least a portion of the policy engine are implemented in a single physical platform.**

Art Unit: 2165

(Column 13, lines 4-9)(Cox).

As per claim 21, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 18, wherein the client request is a request for a file managed by the storage server.**

(Column 2, lines 52-56)(Soltis).

As per claim 24, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 18, wherein the file type of the file is indicated in the information relating to the set of data.**

(Column 2, lines 52-56, wherein the file type is incorporated with the requested file)(Soltis).

As per claim 25, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 18, further comprising using the policy engine to define a criterion in the storage server, for use by the storage server to determine when a subsequent client request is to be referred to the policy engine for resolution.**

(Column 5, lines 38-61)(Cox).

As per claim 26, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 18, wherein applying the policy comprises approving or denying the second request based on an identity of the client.**

Art Unit: 2165

(Column 5, lines 38-61)(Cox).

As per claim 27, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A method as recited in claim 18, wherein applying the policy comprises approving or denying the second request based on an identity of a user of the client.**

(Column 4, lines 62-67)(Cox).

As per claim 34, Soltis discloses:

**A storage system comprising:**

**a storage server to provide a client with access via a network to data in a mass storage facility (Figure 1),**

**the storage server configured to receive from the client a first request to perform a storage-related operation relating to a set of data managed or to be managed by the storage server,**  
(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-26).

**and to generate a second request if the first request satisfies a defined criterion;**

(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-26).

**wherein the storage server responds to the first request by using metadata in the storage server to determine that the set of data is stored externally to, and remotely from, the storage server.**

(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-26, wherein data is storage on shared device separate from the actual server ).

Soltis discloses **the storage server further configured to send a second response to the client in accordance with the first response;**



(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 17-26, wherein request/response are exchanged between client and server) , but does not explicitly disclose of policy engine, However Cox in an analogous of client/server data handling, teaches:

**and a remote policy engine coupled to the storage server to receive the second request and information relating to the set of data from the storage server,**

(FIG. 1)

**the remote policy engine configured to approve or deny the second request by implementing a policy using the information relating to the set of data, to send a first response to the storage server based on a result of implementing the policy,**

(Column 5, lines 38-45 and column 12, lines 50-56)

**and the remote policy engine responds to the second request by retrieving the set of data from remote storage on behalf of the storage server and provides the set of data to the storage server in conjunction with the first response.**

(FIG. 1, and column 4, lines 53-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox by incorporating the teaching of Cox into the method of Soltis. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the policy engine of Cox into the system of Soltis for the purpose of adhering user and system activities to a centralized policy management.

As per claim 35, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A storage system as recited in claim 30, wherein the first request is a request for a file managed by the storage server.**

(Column 2, lines 52-56)(Soltis).

As per claim 38, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A storage system as recited in claim 33, wherein the file type of the file is indicated in the information relating to the set of data.**

(Column 2, lines 52-56, wherein the file type is incorporated with the requested file)(Soltis).

As per claim 39, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A storage system as recited in claim 34, wherein the remote policy engine determines whether to approve or deny the second request based on the client.**

(Column 5, lines 38-61)(Cox).

As per claim 44, Soltis and Cox teach:

**A storage system as recited in claim 34, wherein the storage server does not send the client any response to the first request until the storage server receives the first response from the remote policy engine.**

(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 62-67, illustrate the authentication of the user being done at policy management server wherein intermediary server has to wait for feedback being responding to the client)(Cox).

2. Claims 11-12, 28 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soltis, Steven R (hereinafter Soltis) US Patent No 6697846 and Cox, David E. et al (hereinafter

Art Unit: 2165

Cox) US Patent No 6728766 in view of Petersen, Erik (hereinafter Peterson) US Publication No 20060195616.

As per claim 11, Soltis and Cox storage policy to approve or deny request (FIG. 1 and Column 13, lines 4-7) but do not explicitly teach identifying a server, However in an analogous of data storage, Peterson teaches:

**approve or deny the second request based on an identity of the storage server.**

(Paragraph [0072]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Peterson by incorporating the teaching of Peterson into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the server authentication of Peterson into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of expanding security to be also at server level in multi-server environment.

As per claim 12, Soltis and Cox disclose storage policy engine coupled with plurality of server (FIG. 1) but do not explicitly teach identifying a server, However in an analogous of data storage, Peterson teaches:

**wherein the information relating to the set of data comprises information specifically identifying the storage server from among a plurality of storage servers**

(Paragraph [0072]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Peterson by incorporating the teaching of Peterson into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the server authentication of Peterson into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of expanding security to be also at server level in multi-server environment.

As per claim 28, Soltis and Cox storage policy to approve or deny request (FIG. 1 and Column 13, lines 4-7) but do not explicitly teach identifying a server, However in an analogous of data storage, Peterson teaches:

**approving or denying the second request based on an identity of the storage server.**

(Paragraph [0072]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Peterson by incorporating the teaching of Peterson into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the server authentication of Peterson into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of expanding security to be also at server level in multi-server environment.

As per claim 42, Soltis and Cox disclose storage policy engine coupled with plurality of server (FIG. 1) but do not explicitly teach identifying a server, However in an analogous of data storage, Peterson teaches:

**wherein the information relating to the set of data comprises information specifically identifying the storage server from among a plurality of storage servers**

(Paragraph [0072]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Peterson by incorporating the teaching of Peterson into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the server authentication of Peterson into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of expanding security to be also at server level in multi-server environment.

3. Claims 13-14, 29-32, 40-41 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soltis, Steven R (hereinafter Soltis) US Patent No 6697846 and Cox, David E. et al (hereinafter Cox) US Patent No 6728766 in view of Theimer, Marvin M. et al (hereinafter Theimer) US Patent No 5649099

As per claim 13, Soltis and Cox disclose the policy engine but do not explicitly disclose using quota to approve or deny request, However in an analogous of data storage, Theimer teaches:

**approve or deny the second request based on a quota.**

(Column 2, lines 58-60, access controls: Concepts such as restrictions over file types, access time limits, the homework example restrictions, or resource quotas, touch base upon the restriction of the request based on resource quotas).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Theimer by incorporating the teaching of Theimer into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the quota criteria of Theimer into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of limit the resource access control based on quota.

As per claim 14, Soltis and Cox disclose the policy engine but do not explicitly disclose using frequency of resource access to approve or deny request, However in an analogous of data storage, Theimer teaches:

**approve or deny the second request based on a number of times the set of data has been accessed during a period of time.**

(Column 2, lines 58-60, access controls: Concepts such as restrictions over file types, access time

Art Unit: 2165

limits, the homework example restrictions, or resource quotas, touch base upon the restriction of the request based on resource quotas).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Theimer by incorporating the teaching of Theimer into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the quota criteria of Theimer into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of limit the resource access control based on frequency of use.

As per claim 29, Soltis and Cox disclose the policy engine but do not explicitly disclose using quota to approve or deny request, However in an analogous of data storage, Theimer teaches:

**approving or denying the second request based on a user-based quota.**

(Column 2, lines 58-60, access controls: Concepts such as restrictions over file types, access time limits, the homework example restrictions, or resource quotas, touch base upon the restriction of the request based on resource quotas).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Theimer by incorporating the teaching of Theimer into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the quota criteria of Theimer into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of limit the resource access control based on quota.

As per claim 30, Soltis and Cox disclose the policy engine but do not explicitly disclose using quota to approve or deny request, However in an analogous of data storage, Theimer teaches:

**approving or denying the second request based on a quota applicable to the set of data.**

Art Unit: 2165

(Column 2, lines 58-60, access controls: Concepts such as restrictions over file types, access time limits, the homework example restrictions, or resource quotas, touch base upon the restriction of the request based on resource quotas).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Theimer by incorporating the teaching of Theimer into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the quota criteria of Theimer into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of limit the resource access control based on quota.

As per claim 31, Soltis and Cox disclose the policy engine but do not explicitly disclose using quota to approve or deny request, However in an analogous of data storage, Theimer teaches:

**approving or denying the second request based on a quota applicable to the storage server.**

(Column 2, lines 58-60, access controls: Concepts such as restrictions over file types, access time limits, the homework example restrictions, or resource quotas, touch base upon the restriction of the request based on resource quotas).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Theimer by incorporating the teaching of Theimer into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the quota criteria of Theimer into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of limit the resource access control based on quota.

As per claim 32, Soltis and Cox disclose the policy engine but do not explicitly disclose using frequency of resource access to approve or deny request, However in an analogous of data storage, Theimer teaches:

**approving or denying the second request based on a number of times the set of data has been accessed during a period of time.**

(Column 2, lines 58-60, access controls: Concepts such as restrictions over file types, access time limits, the homework example restrictions, or resource quotas, touch base upon the restriction of the request based on resource quotas).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Theimer by incorporating the teaching of Theimer into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the quota criteria of Theimer into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of limit the resource access control based on frequency of use.

As per claim 40, Soltis and Cox disclose the policy engine but do not explicitly disclose using quota to approve or deny request, However in an analogous of data storage, Theimer teaches:

**approve or deny the second request based on a user-based quota.**

(Column 2, lines 58-60, access controls: Concepts such as restrictions over file types, access time limits, the homework example restrictions, or resource quotas, touch base upon the restriction of the request based on resource quotas).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Theimer by incorporating the teaching of Theimer into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the quota criteria of Theimer into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of limit the resource access control based on quota.



As per claim 41, Soltis and Cox disclose the policy engine but do not explicitly disclose using quota to approve or deny request, However in an analogous of data storage, Theimer teaches:

**approve or deny the second request based on a quota applicable to the set of data.**

(Column 2, lines 58-60, access controls: Concepts such as restrictions over file types, access time limits, the homework example restrictions, or resource quotas, touch base upon the restriction of the request based on resource quotas).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Theimer by incorporating the teaching of Theimer into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use the quota criteria of Theimer into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of limit the resource access control based on quota.

As per claim 43, Soltis and Cox disclose the policy engine but do not explicitly disclose using frequency of resource access to approve or deny request, However in an analogous of data storage, Theimer teaches:

**approve or deny the second request based on a number of times the set of data has been accessed during a period of time.**

(Column 2, lines 58-60, access controls: Concepts such as restrictions over file types, access time limits, the homework example restrictions, or resource quotas, touch base upon the restriction of the request based on resource quotas).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Theimer by incorporating the teaching of Theimer into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated

Art Unit: 2165

to use the quota criteria of Theimer into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of limit the resource access control based on frequency of use.

4. Claims 17 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soltis, Steven R (hereinafter Soltis) US Patent No 6697846 and Cox, David E. et al (hereinafter Cox) US Patent No 6728766 in view of Luk, Shun Hang et al (hereinafter Luk) US Publication No 20060195616.

As per claim 17, Soltis and Cox do not explicitly disclose the file-level and block-level protocol, However in an analogous art of data storage, Luk teaches:

**the plurality of storage protocols including a block-level storage protocol** (Column 7, lines 18-20) **and a file-level storage protocol** (Column 4, lines 60-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Luk by incorporating the teaching of Luk into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use storage protocols of Luk into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of enabling a wide range of storage protocols.

As per claim 46, Soltis and Cox do not explicitly disclose the file-level and block-level protocol, However in an analogous art of data storage, Luk teaches:

**the plurality of storage protocols including a block-level storage protocol** (Column 7, lines 18-20) **and a file-level storage protocol** (Column 4, lines 60-63).

Art Unit: 2165

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Soltis and Cox and Luk by incorporating the teaching of Luk into the method of Soltis and Cox. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to use storage protocols of Luk into the system of Soltis and Cox for the purpose of enabling a wide range of storage protocols.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cox, David E. et al (hereinafter Cox) US Patent No 6728766.

As per claim 47, Cox discloses:

**A storage system comprising:**

**a plurality of storage servers, each to provide a set of clients with access to corresponding stored data;**

(FIG. 1)

**And a policy engine to receive requests from each of the storage servers, each request being based on a previous storage-related request received by one of the storage servers from a client,**

(FIG. 1 and Column 13, lines 4-7).

Art Unit: 2165

**the policy engine configured to respond to each request by implementing one or more of a set of storage-related policies and to send a response to a requesting storage server based on a result of implementing the policy,**

(FIG. 1 and Column 13, lines 4-7).

**wherein one or more of the policies are specific to a particular storage server,**

(FIG. 1 and Column 13, lines 4-7).

**and wherein the storage servers respond to the storage-related requests from clients in a manner synchronous with the responses from the policy engine.**

(FIG. 1 and column 4, lines 62-67, illustrate the authentication of the user being done at policy management server wherein intermediary server has to wait for feedback being responding to the client)(Cox).

As per claim 48, Cox discloses:

**A method of operating a storage server, the method comprising:**

**receiving at the storage server, from a client, a request to perform a storage- related operation relating to a set of data;**

(FIG. 1 and Column 13, lines 4-7).

**if the first request satisfies a defined criterion, then operating the storage server to invoke a policy engine configured to determine a disposition of the request,**

(Column 4, lines 62-67).

**the policy. engine being external to the storage server,**

(FIG. 1).

**wherein the policy engine operates to restrict access to the set of data, including restricting ability to open, close and modify. the set of data;**

(Column 4, lines 62-67, wherein the control access to managed data incorporate restriction to open, close and modify data).

**receiving at the storage server a response from the policy engine indicating a disposition of the request;**

(Column 4, lines 62-67).

**and responding to the request in accordance with the response from the policy engine.**

(Column 4, lines 62-67).

### **Conclusion**

For the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure, please refer to the Notice of Reference form.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tarek Chbouki whose telephone number is 571-2703154. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30 am to 5:00 pm EST. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chace Christian can be reached on 5712724190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

Art Unit: 2165

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tarek Chbouki/

Examiner, Art Unit 2165

9/23/2008

**/Christian P. Chace/**

**Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165**